



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,750	06/27/2003	Naohiro Toda	239522US0	7361
22850	7590	08/10/2007	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				DOTE, JANIS L
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1756				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
08/10/2007			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/606,750	TODA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Janis L. Dote	1756	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,7-26,28,30 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,7-23,28,30 and 31 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1756

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on Jul. 12, 2007, has been entered.

2. The examiner acknowledges the addition of claims 30 and 31 filed on Jul. 12, 2007. Claims 1, 7-26, 28, 30, and 31 are pending.

3. Claims 24-26 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicants timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on Nov. 23, 2005.

Applicants are reminded that if the product claims are found to be allowable, pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Official Gazette notice dated March 26, 1996 (1184 O.G. 86), process claims 24-26, which do not depend from or otherwise

Art Unit: 1756

include all the limitations of the allowable product, will NOT be rejoined.

4. The instant specification at page 12, lines 14-21, discloses that the term "surface roughness" recited in the instant claims "means the ten point mean roughness which can be measured by a method based on JIS B0601. Specifically, the roughness is represented by the difference between the average height of the five projected portions and the average depth of the five recessed portions in a unit length."

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 30 is indefinite in the phrase "the titanyl phthalocyanine further has a lowest angle peak at an angle of $7.3^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$, and wherein an interval between the lowest angle

Art Unit: 1756

peak to a next peak at a high angle side is not less than 1.8° " because it is outside the scope of instant claim 1, from which claim 30 depends. Claim 1 recites that the "the titanyl phthalocyanine further has a lowest angle peak at an angle of $7.3^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$, and wherein an interval between the lowest angle peak to a next peak at a high angle side is not less than 2.0° ." The limitation "not less than 1.8° " includes peaks at smaller angles than does the limitation "not less than 2.0° ."

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1, 7-23, 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1756

(1) Instant claims 1 and 28 recite that the titanyl phthalocyanine X-ray diffraction spectrum has "a peak . . . at an angle of $23.5^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$."

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of such a peak at an angle of $23.5^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$. The originally filed specification at page 6, lines 11-20, describes a titanyl phthalocyanine having an X-ray diffraction spectrum having a maximum peak at a Bragg (2θ) angle of $27.2^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$, "a lowest peak at an angle of $7.3^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$, and no peak at an angle from 7.4° to 9.4° (i.e., an interval between the lowest angle peak to a next peak at a high angle side is not less than 2.0°)," and no peak at an angle of 26.3° . In synthesis example 1, the originally filed specification discloses that the resultant titanyl phthalocyanine has an X-ray diffraction spectrum as shown in Fig. 13, wherein the spectrum has a maximum peak at a Bragg (2θ) angle of $27.2^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ and a lowest peak at an angle of $7.3^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$. The originally filed specification states that no peaks are observed at angles "from 7.4° to 9.4° (i.e., the interval between the lowest angle peak to a next peak at a high angle side is 2.0° or more)" and no peak is observed at an angle of 26.3° . See the originally filed specification at page 66, lines 5-14, and Fig. 13. Table 1 at page 71 of the originally specification reports that the X-ray diffraction

Art Unit: 1756

spectrum of the titanyl phthalocyanine in synthesis example 1 has a maximum peak at a Bragg (2θ) angle of 27.2° , a lowest peak at an angle of 7.3° , a peak at an angle of 9.4° , a peak at an angle of 9.6° , no "peak in a range of 7.4° to 9.4° ," and no peak at an angle of 26.3° . The originally filed specification does not appear to provide any description of a titanyl phthalocyanine X-ray diffraction spectrum having a peak at an angle of $23.5^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ as recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

(2) Instant claims 1 and 28 also recite that the titanyl phthalocyanine X-ray diffraction spectrum has "a peak at an angle of 9.5° and a peak at an angle of 9.7° ."

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of such peaks at a Bragg angle of 9.5° and at a Bragg angle of 9.7° . As discussed in item (1) above, in synthesis example 1, the originally filed specification discloses that the resultant titanyl phthalocyanine has an X-ray diffraction spectrum that is shown in Fig. 13, wherein the spectrum has a maximum peak at a Bragg (2θ) angle of $27.2^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ and a lowest peak at an angle of $7.3^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$. The originally filed specification states that no peaks are observed at angles from " 7.4° to 9.4° (i.e., the interval between the lowest angle peak to a next peak at a high angle side is 2.0° or more)" and no peak is observed at an angle of

Art Unit: 1756

26.3°. See the originally filed specification at page 66, lines 5-14, and Fig. 13. Table 1 at page 71 of the originally specification reports that the X-ray diffraction spectrum of the titanyl phthalocyanine in synthesis example 1 has a maximum peak at a Bragg (2θ) angle of 27.2°, a lowest peak at an angle of 7.3°, a peak at an angle of 9.4°, a peak at an angle of 9.6°, no "peak in a range of 7.4° to 9.4°," and no peak at an angle of 26.3°. The originally filed specification does not appear to provide any description of a titanyl phthalocyanine X-ray diffraction spectrum having a peak at an angle of 9.5° or a peak at an angle of 9.7° as recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

(3) Instant claim 30, which depends from claim 1, recites that the "the titanyl phthalocyanine further has a lowest angle peak at an angle of $7.3^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$, and wherein an interval between the lowest angle peak to a next peak at a high angle side is not less than 1.8° ."

The originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of such peaks as recited in instant claim 30. As discussed in item (1) above, the originally filed specification describes a titanyl phthalocyanine having an X-ray diffraction spectrum having a "a lowest peak at an angle of $7.3^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$, and no peak at an angle from 7.4° to 9.4° (i.e., an interval between the lowest angle peak to a next peak at a high

Art Unit: 1756

angle side is not less than 2.0°)." The originally filed specification does not appear to provide any description of a titanyl phthalocyanine X-ray diffraction spectrum having peaks recited in instant claim 30.

Applicants' arguments filed on Jul. 12, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(1) Applicants again assert that the Rule 132 declaration, which was executed by Tatsuya Niimi on Jan. 29, 2007, and which was filed on Jan. 29, 2007 (Niimi declaration I), shows that the raw data of the X-ray diffraction spectrum illustrated in Fig. 13 of the instant specification supports a peak (i.e., peak No. 18, 23.450°) at a Bragg angle of $23.5 \pm 0.2^\circ$. Applicants further assert that the Rule 132 declaration, which was executed by Tatsuya Niimi on Jul. 4, 2007, and which was filed on Jul. 12, 2007 (Niimi declaration II), shows that the X-ray diffraction spectrum illustrated in Fig. 13 of the instant specification clearly supports a peak at a Bragg angle of $23.5 \pm 0.2^\circ$.

Applicants' assertions are not persuasive. As discussed in the office action mailed on Apr. 12, 2007, paragraph 6, page 6, the showing in Niimi declaration I is not part of the originally filed specification. Applicants have not indicated where in the originally filed specification, by page and line number, there

Art Unit: 1756

is an adequate general description of the peak at a Bragg angle of 23.450° . In addition, Niimi declaration II states that "[i]t is clear from Fig. 13-1 [in the declaration, an enlarged view of Fig. 13 of the instant specification] that there is a clear peak at 23.5° ." However, the claimed peak at a "Bragg angle of $23.5 \pm 0.2^\circ$ " is broader than that shown in Fig. 13 of the instant specification, because it includes peaks at Bragg angles in the range of 23.3° to 23.7° . Applicants have not indicated where in the originally filed specification, by page and line number, there is an adequate general description of the peak at a Bragg angle of " $23.5 \pm 0.2^\circ$." Furthermore, for the reasons discussed in item (2), infra, the disclosure in the originally filed specification also appears to contradict the showing in two declarations. Furthermore, instant claims 1 and 28 do not limit the titanyl phthalocyanine (TiOPc) X-ray diffraction spectrum to be the particular X-ray diffraction pattern shown of Fig. 13. Rather, instant claims 1 and 28 merely require that the titanyl phthalocyanine have an X-ray diffraction spectrum having particular peaks. The originally filed specification at page 73, lines 5-8, discloses that the titanyl phthalocyanine in synthesis example 8 "had the same [X-ray diffraction] spectrum as that of the TiOPc obtained in Synthesis 1." However, the X-ray diffraction pattern shown in Fig. 14 of the TiOPc in

synthesis no. 8 is not the same as that shown in Fig. 13 of the TiOPc in synthesis No. 1. The spectrum in Fig. 14 does not appear to have a "peak" at a Bragg angle of $23.5^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$. Thus, based on the evidence in the originally filed specification, the originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of the TiOPc having the broadly recited X-ray diffraction spectrum having a peak at a Bragg angle of $23.5 \pm 0.2^\circ$ as recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

Furthermore, applicants' arguments that the X-ray diffraction spectrum of the Nukada (not "Nukuda" as cited by applicants) titanyl phthalocyanine are the same as those previously presented in the response filed on Jan. 29, 2007, which were addressed in the office action mailed on Apr. 12, 2007.

(2) Applicants again assert that peaks at Bragg angles 9.5° and 9.7° are supported by the raw data of Fig. 13 of the instant specification, as shown in Niimi declaration I, peaks Nos. 2 and 3, 9.460° and 9.680° , respectively. Applicants further assert that Fig. 13-2 of Niimi declaration II, which is an enlarged view of Fig. 13 of the instant specification, supports the peaks at Bragg angles $9.4^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ and $9.6^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$.

Applicants' assertions are not persuasive. As discussed in the office action mailed on Apr. 12, 2007, paragraph 6, page 9,

the showing in Niimi declaration I is not part of the originally filed specification. Applicants have not indicated where in the originally filed specification, by page and line number, there is an adequate general description of the peaks at those Bragg angles of 9.460° and 9.680°. Moreover, the disclosure in the originally filed specification appears to contradict the raw data shown in Niimi declaration I. As noted in the rejection in item (2) above and discussed in the rejection mailed on Apr. 12, 2007, the originally filed specification in Table 1 at page 71 reports that the X-ray diffraction spectrum in Fig. 13 exhibits peaks at angles of "9.4°" and "9.6°." The raw data for Fig. 13 in Niimi declaration I does not list peaks at angles of 9.4° and 9.6°. Rather, the raw data lists peaks at angles of 9.460° and 9.680°, or as asserted by applicants, at 9.5° and 9.7°.

Applicants have not explained the inconsistency between the disclosure in originally filed Table 1 and the showing in Niimi declaration I. Furthermore, Niimi declaration II states that FIG. 13-2 shows that there are peaks at $9.4^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ and $9.6^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$. Niimi declaration II does not state that there are peaks at 9.5° and 9.7° as recited in instant claims 1 and 28. In addition, as discussed in item (1) above, instant claims 1 and 28 do not limit the titanyl phthalocyanine (TiOPc) X-ray diffraction spectrum to be the particular X-ray diffraction

pattern shown of Fig. 13. Furthermore, although the originally filed specification states that the TiOPc of synthesis of example 8 has the same X-ray diffraction spectrum as that in synthesis example 1, the spectrum in Fig. 14 of the TiOPc of synthesis 8 is not the same as that shown in Fig. 13. The spectrum in Fig. 14 also does not appear to have "peaks" at Bragg angles of 9.5° and 9.7°. Thus, based on the evidence in the originally filed specification, the originally filed specification does not provide an adequate written description of the TiOPc having the broadly recited X-ray diffraction spectrum having peaks at Bragg angles of 9.5° and 9.7° in instant claims 1 and 28.

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

10. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-20, 22, 23, 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0076633 A1 (Niimi'633), as evidenced by applicants' admission at page 87, lines 22-23, of the instant specification (applicants' admission I) and by the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, combined with: (1) US 5,871,875 (Chambers); (2) US 5,776,650 (Hashimoto); and (3) US 6,623,899 B2 (Takaya).

Art Unit: 1756

Niimi'633 discloses an electrophotographic photoreceptor comprising an electroconductive substrate; an undercoat layer; a charge generation layer; a charge transport layer formed on the charge generation layer using a halogen-free solvent, and a protective layer. The charge generation layer comprises a polyvinyl butyral resin and a bisazo charge generation material. The charge transport layer is obtained by coating the charge generation layer with a coating solution comprising a binder resin, a charge transport compound, and the solvent tetrahydrofuran. The protective layer comprises a charge transport polymer comprising a triarylamine moiety in a side chain and particulate alumina filler having a specific resistivity of $2.5 \times 10^{12} \Omega \cdot \text{m}$. See refining example 6 at pages 24-25, paragraphs 0346-0351; pages 25-26, paragraphs 0358 to 0367; and example 6 at page 27, paragraphs 0380-0381. The Niimi'633 charge transport layer meets the charge transport layer limitations recited in instant claims 1, 16, and 28. The protective layer in example 6 meets the protective layer limitations recited in instant claims 10-12 and 14.

Niimi'633 does not teach the problems of using chlorinated solvents. However, it is well known in the electrophotographic arts that the use of chlorinated solvents has environmental safety problems. See Chambers, col. 2, lines 14-21. According

to Chambers, chlorinated solvents, such as dichloroethane, monochlorobenzene, and methylene chloride, provide charge transport layers having good coating quality. However, Chambers discloses that "chlorinated solvents have environmental safety problems . . . the use of these solvents requires solvent abatement systems in order to eliminate leakage. Therefore, non-chlorinated solvent systems that provide coating qualities similar to or better than those of chlorinated solvent systems are desired."

Niimi'633 also does not identify its alumina filler as a "α-alumina" as recited in instant claim 13. However, as discussed supra, the Niimi'633 alumina filler has a specific resistivity of $2.5 \times 10^{12} \Omega\cdot\text{m}$. The instant specification discloses a "α-alumina" having a specific resistivity of $2.5 \times 10^{12} \Omega\cdot\text{m}$. Instant specification, page 87, lines 22-23. Because the Niimi'633 alumina filler has the same specific resistivity as the "α-alumina" disclosed in the instant specification and is used for the same purpose as a filler in a protective layer for a photoreceptor, it is reasonable to presume that the Niimi'633 alumina filler is an "α-alumina" as recited in instant claim 13. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

Niimi'633 further discloses that its photoreceptor may be used as the photoreceptor in an image forming apparatus or a process cartridge. The image forming apparatus comprises at least one image forming unit, which comprises a photoreceptor 1, a charger 8, a light irradiator 5, an image developer 11, and a transfer device 15. Page 4, paragraph 0061; Fig. 3; and page 21, paragraphs 0300-0305. Niimi'633 teaches that the light irradiator is preferably a laser diode or a light emitting diode as recited in instant claim 19, and that the charger is preferably a contact charger or a proximity charger as recited in instant claims 20 and 22. Page 4, paragraph 0062; and page 21, paragraph 0304. Niimi'633 further teaches that the image forming apparatus can comprise a plurality of image forming units. See Fig. 7, and pages 22-23, paragraphs 0321-0324. The Niimi'633 process cartridge comprises a photoreceptor 43, and at least one of a charger 40, an image irradiator 41, or an image developer 45. Page 5, paragraph 0063; Fig. 5; and page 22, paragraph 0319.

Niimi'633 further teaches that the charge generation material in the charge generation layer can preferably be a titanyl phthalocyanine pigment having an X-ray diffraction spectrum in which a highest peak is observed at Bragg 2θ angle of $27.2^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ when a specific X-ray of Cu-K α having a

Art Unit: 1756

wavelength of 1.541 Å irradiates the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment. Paragraph 0151 and example 28 at page 32, paragraph 0476. In example 28, the exemplified charge generation layer comprises a titanyl phthalocyanine pigment having the X-ray diffraction spectrum shown in Fig. 6 and a polyvinyl butyral binder resin. The diffraction spectrum in Fig. 6 further has a lowest angle peak at 7.4°, a peak at 9.5°, a peak at 9.7°, a peak at 23.5°, and no peak at 26.3°. See Fig. 6. The interval between the peaks at 7.4° and 9.5° meet the limitation "an interval . . . is not less than 2.0°" recited in instant claims 1 and 28 and the limitations recited in instant claims 30 and 31. The peaks at 27.2°, 7.4°, 9.5°, 9.7°, and 23.5°, and no peak at 26.3° meet the limitations in the "X-ray diffraction spectrum" recited in instant claims 1 and 28. The locations of the peaks at 7.4°, 9.5°, 9.7°, and 23.5° were determined by measuring the positions of the peaks with a ruler and correlating the positions with the x-axis in Fig. 6.

Niimi'633 does not explicitly identify the chemical structure of its titanyl phthalocyanine. However, as evidenced by the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, it is well known that titanyl phthalocyanine has a chemical structure that is within the compositional limitations of formula (1) recited in instant claim 28, when the indexes m, n, j, and k are 0. Thus,

Niimi'633 titanyl phthalocyanine meets the X-ray diffraction spectrum limitations and chemical structure recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

As discussed supra, the Niimi'633 X-ray diffraction spectrum is obtained using a Cu-K α X-ray having a wavelength of 1.541 Å, not 1.542 Å, as recited in instant claims 1 and 28. However, as discussed supra, the X-ray diffraction spectrum of the Niimi'633 titanyl phthalocyanine pigment meets the "X-ray diffraction spectrum" recited in instant claims 1, 28, 30, and 31. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the X-ray diffraction spectrum disclosed in Niimi'633 is the same as that obtained when a Cu-K α X-ray having a wavelength of 1.542 Å is used. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise.

Fitzgerald, supra.

Niimi'633 does not exemplify a charge generation layer comprising its titanyl phthalocyanine pigment having an average particle diameter as recited in the instant claims. However, as discussed above, Niimi'633 exemplifies a charge generation layer comprising its titanyl phthalocyanine and a polyvinyl butyral binder resin. See example 28 at paragraph 0476. Niimi'633 teaches that the charge generation layer is prepared by mixing the charge generation material with a proper solvent and binder resin and dispersing the mixture with "a ball mill . . . to

prepare a coating liquid." Paragraphs 0154-0157.

Hashimoto teaches a method of preparing a charge generation dispersion liquid for forming a charge generation layer comprising the step of dispersing a charge generation pigment or dye and a binder resin with a ball-shaped pulverizing media in a dispersing solvent to an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm . Col. 2, lines 52-68. Hashimoto exemplifies forming charge generation layers with said charge generation dispersion liquid where the average particle size of the organic pigment or dye dispersoids is either 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm . See the 1st and 2nd embodiments at col. 6, line 33-64, and col. 7, lines 26-30, and in Table 1 at col. 8. The average particle sizes of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm , are within the particle diameter limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claims 1 and 28. Hashimoto teaches that the charge generation pigments or dyes "are not specifically limited as far as the pigments or the dyes may function as a charge generating agent in a charge generation layer. For example, pigments such as phthalocyanine pigments . . ." Col. 4, lines 45-50. According to Hashimoto, when the organic pigment or dye is dispersed in a resin binder as taught by Hashimoto to an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , the "pigment or dye dispersoids are prevented from coagulating for a time period

Art Unit: 1756

long enough to cause no problems in practical use of the dispersion liquid." Col. 4, lines 20-28. Hashimoto teaches that its dispersion liquid "exhibits excellent stability of the pigment or dye dispersoids, facilitates manufacturing electro-photographic photoconductors having a charge generation layer which exhibits excellent photographic properties." Col. 4, lines 29-33. The photoconductor also has improved stability. Col. 2, lines 41-43.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of Niimi'633 and Hashimoto, to prepare a charge generation dispersion coating solution comprising the Niimi'633 titanyl phthalocyanine pigment and polyvinylbutyral resin, as taught by Hashimoto, such that the resultant dispersion solution comprises titanyl phthalocyanine pigment dispersoids having an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm . It would have also been obvious for that person, in view of the teachings of Chambers, to use the resultant dispersion solution to form the charge generation layer in the Niimi'633 photoreceptor in example 1 that comprises the charge transport layer formed using tetrahydrofuran. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic photoreceptor, an image forming apparatus, and a process

cartridge without the use of environmental problem chlorinated solvents and that have improved stability and excellent photoconductive properties as taught by Hashimoto.

Instant claim 7 is written in product-by-process format. The combined teachings of Niimi'633 and Hashimoto do not disclose that the charge generation layer is formed by the method recited in the instant claim 7. However, as discussed above, the combined teachings of Niimi'633 and Hashimoto render obvious a titanyl phthalocyanine pigment having an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm . The average particle sizes of 0.15 or 0.18 μm meet the average particle size limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claim 7. Because the average particle size of 0.15 or 0.18 μm is much smaller than the average particle size limitation of not greater than 0.3 μm recited in instant claim 7, it is reasonable to conclude that the average particle size of 0.15 or 0.18 μm meets the particle size standard deviation of "not greater than 0.2 μm " recited in instant claim 7. Thus, it appears that the charge generation layer rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Niimi'633 and Hashimoto is the same or substantially the same as the instantly recited charge generation layer made by the process recited in

instant claim 7. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985); MPEP 2113.

Instant claim 8 is written in product-by-process format. Niimi'633 does not disclose that its titanyl phthalocyanine material is obtained by the method recited in instant claim 8. However, the Niimi'633 titanyl phthalocyanine pigment exhibits an X-ray diffraction spectrum that meets the limitations recited in instant claims 1, 28, 30, and 31. The titanyl phthalocyanine pigment average particle size of 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Niimi'633 and Hashimoto meets the particle size limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claims 1 and 28. Therefore, it appears that the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Niimi'633 and Hashimoto is the same or substantially the same as the instantly recited titanyl phthalocyanine crystal made by the process steps recited in the instant claim. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. Marosi; Thorpe; MPEP 2113.

Niimi'633 also does not exemplify a photoreceptor comprising an undercoat layer having the surface roughness as recited in the instant claims. However, Niimi'633 does not

Art Unit: 1756

limit the type of undercoat layer used. Page 12,
paragraph 0180; and reference claim 22.

Takaya teaches the use of a particular intermediate layer located between the charge generation layer and the electroconductive substrate of an electrophotographic photosensitive member. Takaya discloses that the intermediate layer has a layer thickness of at least 0.5 μm and comprises aggregated particles of $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$, where n is a number of at least 0 representing "a degree of hydration." Col. 3, lines 55-63. Takaya teaches that the intermediate layer preferably has a 10-point surface roughness R_z (according to JIS B06010) of "0.1 to 1 μm so as to provide improved function of preventing the occurrence of interference fringes sometimes encountered in an electrophotographic apparatus of a digital scheme using coherent light such as laser light as exposure light." Col. 7, lines 1-8. Takaya exemplifies an intermediate layer having a 10-point surface roughness R_z of 0.5 μm . See, for example, example 1, col. 10, lines 13-27. Takaya discloses that its intermediate layer "can be formed in a crack-free state inexpensively and without requiring a special technique by using a coating liquid of a good storage stability." Col. 3, lines 34-37. According to Takaya, prior art intermediate layers comprising a polyamide resin are "liable to have an electrical

Art Unit: 1756

resistance which is liable to change depending on environmental changes, so that it has been difficult to provide an electrophotographic photosensitive member having stable and excellent potential characteristics in all environments ranging from low temperature/low humidity to high temperature/high humidity." Col. 2, lines 14-27. Takaya discloses that photosensitive members comprising its particular intermediate layer solve the above-mentioned problems of the prior art. Col. 3, lines 27-30. Takaya discloses that such photosensitive members exhibit "excellent potential characteristic and image forming characteristic free from difficulties, such as lower image density or black spots and fog, over a variety of temperature and humidity environment conditions even at a smaller thickness of photosensitive layer." Col. 3, lines 39-46; example 1, col. 11, lines 12-19; and Table 1 at col. 13, example 1.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings in Takaya, to use the undercoat layer taught by Takaya having a 10-point surface roughness Rz of 0.5 μm as the undercoat layer in the photoreceptor rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Niimi'633, Chambers, and Hashimoto, and to use the resultant photoreceptor in the image forming apparatus and process

Art Unit: 1756

cartridge rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Niimi'633, Chambers, and Hashimoto. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic photoreceptor, an image forming apparatus, and a process cartridge that prevent the occurrence of interference fringes and exhibit excellent potential characteristics and image forming characteristics free from difficulties over a variety of temperature and humidity environment conditions as disclosed by Takaya.

The combined teachings of Niimi'633, Hashimoto, and Takaya meet the surface roughness - particle size relationships recited in instant claims 1 and 28. As discussed supra, the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment particles in the charge generation layer rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Niimi'633 and Hashimoto have an average particle size of 0.15 or 0.18 μm . The average particle sizes of 0.15 and 0.18 μm are smaller than the Takaya undercoat layer 10-point surface roughness of 0.5 μm and are also not greater than 2/3 of the roughness of 0.5 μm (i.e., 0.33 μm), as recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

11. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niimi'633, as evidenced by applicants' admission I and by the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, combined

with: (1) Chambers; (2) Hashimoto; and (2) Takaya, as applied to claim 20 above, further combined with US 2002/0051654 A1 (Niimi'654).

The claims are rejected for the reasons discussed in the office action mailed on Oct. 30, 2006, paragraph 11, which are incorporated herein by reference.

12. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,399,262 B1 (Oshiba) combined with: (1) Chambers; (2) Japanese Patent 2000-319538 (JP'358), as evidenced by Ladd et al., Structure Determination by X-ray Diffraction, p. 426 (Ladd); and (3) Hashimoto. See the USPTO English-language translation of JP'358 for cites.

Oshiba discloses an electrophotographic photoreceptor comprising an aluminum cylinder, as the electroconductive substrate, an intermediate layer, a charge generation layer, a charge transport layer, and a protective layer. The aluminum cylinder has a 10-point average surface roughness (Rz) of 1.0 μm , which is subjected to an alumite process. Col. 30, lines 1-24; col. 39, line 20, to col. 40, line 37; and example 26 at col. 41. The alumite process comprises the step of subjecting the aluminum cylinder to anodic oxidation

Art Unit: 1756

treatment. Col. 33, lines 39-48. The Oshiba conductive aluminum cylinder meets the conductive substrate limitation recited in instant claim 15. The surface layer comprises a siloxane resin that has "charge transportability." See example 26. The Oshiba surface layer meets the compositional limitations recited in instant claims 10 and 14.

According to Oshiba, when a photoreceptor comprises the Oshiba conductive substrate and surface layer, the photoreceptor exhibits high surface hardness, high wear resistance, and high flaw resistance. The photoreceptor exhibits consistent electrophotographic properties at high temperature and high humidity during repeated use. The photoreceptor repeatedly produces excellent images, and does not "form a moire during the formation of digital images employing a laser beam and the like." Col. 3, lines 8-15.

Oshiba further discloses that its photoreceptor may be used as the photoreceptor in an image forming apparatus or a process cartridge. The image forming apparatus comprises a photoreceptor 10, a charger 12, an exposing unit 13, developing units 14, and a transfer device 18. Fig. 1, and col. 31, line 42, to col. 32, line 37. Oshiba teaches that the exposing unit 13 comprises a laser diode as the exposure light as recited in instant claim 19. Col. 31, lines 57-59. Oshiba further

Art Unit: 1756

teaches that the image forming apparatus comprises a detachable process cartridge that comprises the photoreceptor 10, the charger 40, a separation unit, and a cleaning unit. Fig. 1 and col. 32, lines 63-65.

The charge transport layer in the photoreceptor in example 26 of Oshiba is obtained by coating the charge generation layer with a coating solution comprising a binder resin, a charge transport compound, and the solvent 1,2-dichlorethane. However, Oshiba teaches that the solvent can most preferably be, in addition to 1,2-dichloroetane, dichlormethane or methyl ethyl ketone. Col. 30, lines 47-49. The solvent methyl ethyl ketone meets the non-halogen solvent compositional limitations recited in instant claims 1 and 28. The choice of methyl ethyl ketone from a list of three solvents would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

Furthermore, it is well known in the electrophotographic arts that the use of chlorinated solvents has environmental safety problems. See Chambers, col. 2, lines 14-21. According to Chambers, chlorinated solvents, such as dichloromethane, dichloroethane, monochlorobenzene, and methylene chloride, provide charge transport layers having good coating quality. However, Chambers discloses that "chlorinated solvents have

Art Unit: 1756

environmental safety problems . . . the use of these solvents requires solvent abatement systems in order to eliminate leakage. Therefore, non-chlorinated solvent systems that provide coating qualities similar to or better than those of chlorinated solvent systems are desired."

The charge generation layer in the photoreceptor in example 26 of Oshiba is obtained from a coating solution comprising a titanyl phthalocyanine pigment, a binder resin, and the solvent methyl ethyl ketone. Oshiba does not exemplify a charge generation layer comprising a polyvinyl acetal resin and the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment having an average particle diameter and having an X-ray diffraction spectrum as recited in the instant claims.

However, Oshiba discloses that the charge generation layer can comprise a phthalocyanine pigment as the charge generation material and a binder resin. Oshiba does not limit the type of binder resin used. Col. 27, lines 61-62; and col. 28, line 49.

JP'538 teaches a titanyl phthalocyanine pigment that meets the compositional limitations of the chemical formula recited in instant claim 28. Translation, paragraph 0008. The titanyl phthalocyanine pigment has an X-ray diffraction spectrum in which a highest peak is observed at Bragg 2θ angle of $27.2^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ and a lowest peak at an angle of 7.3° , when a specific X-ray

of Cu-K α having a wavelength of 1.514 Å irradiates the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment. Translation, paragraph 0012, and example 1 in paragraphs 0047-0052 and in Table 1, and Fig. 5. JP'538 teaches that there are no peaks between Bragg angles 7.4° and 9.4°. Translation, paragraph 0012. The interval between the peaks meets the limitation of "an interval . . . is not less than 2.0°" recited in instant claims 1 and 28 and meets the limitations recited in instant claims 30 and 31. The diffraction spectrum further has a peak at 9.5°, a peak at 9.7°, a peak at 23.5°, and no peak at 26.3°. See Fig. 5. The peaks at 27.2°, 7.3°, 9.5°, 9.7°, and 23.5°, and no peak at 26.3° meet the limitations in the "X-ray diffraction spectrum" recited in instant claims 1 and 28. The locations of the peaks at angles 9.5°, 9.7°, and 23.5° were determined by measuring the positions of the peaks with a ruler and correlating the positions with the x-axis in Fig. 5. JP'538 further discloses forming a charge generating coating solution by dispersing a particular polyvinyl butyral binder resin and the titanyl phthalocyanine in the solvent methyl ethyl ketone using a ball mill. Translation, paragraph 0058, example 1. According to JP'538, when its titanyl phthalocyanine pigment is used as the charge generation material in the charge generation layer in a photoreceptor, the resulting photoreceptor has high photosensitivity even after

repeated use. The chargeability of the photoreceptor does not decrease and the residual potential does not increase after repeated use. Translation, paragraphs 0006 and 0070.

The JP'538 reported wavelength of 1.514 Å appears to be a typographic error. The Cu-K α wavelength of 1.514 Å does not appear to exist. It is well known that the Cu-K α spectra line is a doublet consisting of α_1 ($\lambda = 1.5405$) and α_2 ($\lambda = 1.5443$). The weighted mean K α line is 1.542 Å, which is the value normally used in Cu-K α X-ray diffraction. See Ladd, p. 426. Accordingly, because JP'538 teaches using the X-ray of Cu-K α and that Cu-K α is known in the art to have mean wavelength of 1.542 Å, it is reasonable to presume that the X-ray diffraction spectrum disclosed in JP'538 is determined with Cu-K α having a wavelength of 1.542 Å, as recited in the instant claims. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. Fitzgerald, supra.

JP'538 does not exemplify a charge generation layer coating solution comprising its titanyl phthalocyanine pigment having an average particle diameter as recited in the instant claims. However, as discussed supra, JP'538 exemplifies a charge generation layer coating solution obtained by dispersing a particular polyvinyl butyral binder resin and its titanyl phthalocyanine in a solvent using a ball mill.

Hashimoto teaches a method of preparing a charge generation

dispersion liquid for forming a charge generation layer comprising the step of dispersing a charge generation pigment or dye with a binder resin with a ball-shaped pulverizing media in a dispersing solvent to an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 or 0.18 μm . The average particle sizes of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 or 0.18 μm , are within the particle diameter limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claims 1 and 28. The discussion of Hashimoto in paragraph 10 above is incorporated herein by reference.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of Oshiba and Chambers, to use methyl ethyl ketone as the solvent in forming the charge transport layer in the photoreceptor disclosed by Oshiba. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining a photoreceptor having the benefits disclosed by Oshiba without the use of environmental problem chlorinated solvents. It would have also been obvious for that person, in view of the teachings of JP'538 and Hashimoto, to prepare a charge generation dispersion coating solution comprising the JP'538 titanyl phthalocyanine pigment and its particular polyvinylbutyral resin, as taught by Hashimoto, such that the resultant dispersion solution comprises titanyl phthalocyanine pigment dispersoids having an average particle

size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 or 0.18 μm , and to use the resultant dispersion solution to form the charge generation layer in the photoreceptor rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Oshiba and Chambers. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic photoreceptor, an image forming apparatus, and a process cartridge have high photosensitivity and stable charging properties and residual potential properties after repeated use, as taught by JP'538, and that have further improved stability and excellent photoconductive properties as taught by Hashimoto.

Instant claim 7 is written in product-by-process format. The combined teachings of JP'538 and Hashimoto do not disclose that the charge generation layer is formed by the method recited in the instant claim 7. However, as discussed above, the combined teachings of JP'538 and Hashimoto render obvious a titanyl phthalocyanine pigment having an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm . The average particle sizes of 0.15 or 0.18 μm meet the average particle size limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claim 7. Because the average particle size of 0.15 or 0.18 μm is much smaller than the average particle size limitation of not greater than 0.3 μm recited in instant claim 7, it is reasonable

Art Unit: 1756

to conclude that the average particle size of 0.15 or 0.18 μm meets the particle size standard deviation of "not greater than 0.2 μm " recited in instant claim 7. Thus, it appears that the charge generation layer rendered obvious over the combined teachings of JP'538 and Hashimoto is the same or substantially the same as the instantly recited charge generation layer made by the process recited in instant claim 7. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985); MPEP 2113.

Instant claim 8 is written in product-by-process format. JP'538 does not disclose that its titanyl phthalocyanine material is obtained by the method recited in instant claim 8. However, the JP'538 titanyl phthalocyanine pigment exhibits an X-ray diffraction spectrum that meets the limitations recited in instant claims 1, 28, 30, and 31. The titanyl phthalocyanine pigment average particle size of 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm rendered obvious over the combined teachings of JP'538 and Hashimoto meets the particle size limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claims 1, 28, 30, and 31. Therefore, it appears that the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment rendered obvious over the combined teachings of JP'538 and Hashimoto is the same or substantially the same as the instantly recited titanyl

phthalocyanine crystal made by the process steps recited in the instant claim. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. Marosi; Thorpe; MPEP 2113.

The combined teachings of Oshiba, JP'538, and Hashimoto meet the surface roughness - particle size relationships recited in instant claims 1 and 28. As discussed supra, the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment particles in the charge generation layer rendered obvious over the combined teachings of JP'538 and Hashimoto have an average particle size of 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm . The average particle sizes of 0.15 and 0.18 μm are smaller than the Oshiba aluminum cylinder surface roughness of 1.0 μm and are also not greater than 2/3 of the roughness of 1.0 μm (i.e., 0.66 μm), as recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

13. Claims 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshiba combined with: (1) Chambers; (2) JP'538, as evidenced by Ladd; and (3) Hashimoto, as applied to claim 1 above, further combined with US 5,496,671 (Tamura).

Oshiba combined with: (1) Chambers; (2) JP'538, as evidenced by Ladd; and (2) Hashimoto renders obvious an electrophotographic photoreceptor as described in paragraph 12, which is incorporated herein by reference.

Oshiba does not exemplify a charge transport layer comprising a charge transport polymer as recited in instant claim 9. However, Oshiba does not limit the type of charge transport layer used. See reference claim 4.

Tamura teaches a charge transport layer comprising a charge transport polymer comprising a triarylamine moiety in the side chain of the polymer, which meets the charge transport polymer limitation recited in instant claim 9. The charge transport layer is formed by coating the charge generation layer with a solution comprising the carbon-carbon double bond containing triarylamine compound CTM-3, a carbon-carbon double bond-containing monomer, and toluene, and photo-setting the coating to form the charge transport polymeric layer. CTM-3 at col. 7; synthesis example 1 at col. 42; and example 1 at col. 43, lines 15-26. Toluene is a non-chlorinated solvent, which avoids the environmental safety problems disclosed by Chambers. Toluene also meets the non-halogenated aromatic hydrocarbon solvent limitation recited in instant claim 16. The Tamura charge transport layer meets the charge transport layer limitations recited in instant claims 9 and 16. According to Tamura, an electrophotographic photoconductor comprising its charge transport layer has improved mechanical strength and high photosensitivity and durability. Col. 1, lines 57-60.

Art Unit: 1756

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings in Tamura, to use the charge transport layer taught by Tamura as the charge transport layer in the photoreceptor rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Oshiba, Chambers, JP'538, and Hashimoto. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic photoreceptor that has improved mechanical strength and high photosensitivity and durability as taught by Tamura.

14. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-23, 28, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent 1,205,808 A1 (Tamoto), as evidenced by the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, combined with Hashimoto and Takaya.

Tamoto discloses electrophotographic photoreceptors comprising an electroconductive substrate; an undercoat layer; a charge generation layer; a charge transport layer formed on the charge generation layer using a halogen-free solvent, and a protective layer. See paragraphs 0361 and 0418, and examples 32 and 35 in paragraphs 0424 and 0430, respectively.

The charge generation layer comprises a titanyl phthalocyanine having the X-ray diffraction spectrum in Fig. 10 and a polyvinyl butyral resin. The layer has a thickness of

0.2 μm . The X-ray diffraction spectrum in Fig. 10 has a maximum peak at a Bragg angle of 27.2° , a lowest angle peak at 7.3° , a peak at 9.5° , a peak at 9.7° , a peak at 23.5° , and no peak at 26.3° . See Fig. 10. The interval between the peaks at 7.3° and 9.5° meet the limitation "an interval . . . is not less than 2.0° " recited in instant claims 1 and 28 and the limitations recited in instant claims 30 and 31. The peaks at 27.2° , 7.3° , 9.5° , 9.7° , and 23.5° , and no peak at 26.3° meet the limitations in the "X-ray diffraction spectrum" recited in instant claims 1 and 28. The locations of the peaks at angles 7.3° , 9.5° , 9.7° , 23.5° , and 27.2° were determined by measuring the positions of the peaks with a ruler and correlating the positions with the x-axis in Fig. 10. Tamoto does not explicitly identify the chemical structure of its titanyl phthalocyanine. However, as evidenced by the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, it is well known that titanyl phthalocyanine has a chemical structure that is within the compositional limitations of formula (1) recited in instant claim 28, when the indexes m, n, j, and k are 0.

Tamoto does not explicitly disclose that the X-ray diffraction spectrum is determined with a Cu-K α X-ray having a wavelength of 1.542 Å, as recited in instant claims 1 and 28. However, as discussed above, the X-ray diffraction spectrum in Fig. 10 of Tamoto meets the limitations in the "X-ray

diffraction spectrum" recited in instant claims 1, 28, 30, and 31. Thus, it is reasonable to presume that the X-ray diffraction spectrum in Fig. 10 of Tamoto is determined with Cu-K α having a wavelength of 1.542 Å, as recited in the instant claims. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise.

Fitzgerald, supra.

The charge transport layer is obtained by coating the charge generation layer with a coating solution comprising a polycarbonate binder resin, a charge transport compound, and the solvent toluene. In example 32, the protective layer comprises a binder resin, a charge transport compound, and an α -alumina filler having a resistivity of not less than 10^{10} $\Omega\cdot m$. In example 35, the protective layer comprises a charge transport polymer comprising a triarylamine moiety in a side chain (formula 14) and an α -alumina filler. The Niimi'633 charge transport layer meets the charge transport layer limitations recited in instant claims 1, 16, and 28. The protective layers in examples 32 and 35 meet the protective layer limitations recited in instant claims 10-13 and claims 10 and 14, respectively.

Tamoto further discloses that its photoreceptor may be used as the photoreceptor in an image forming apparatus or a process cartridge. The image forming apparatus comprises at least one

Art Unit: 1756

image forming unit, which comprises a photoreceptor 1, a charger 3, a light irradiator 5, an image developer 6, and a transfer device 10. Paragraphs 0240-0241 and Fig. 6. Tamoto teaches that the light irradiator can be a laser diode or a light emitting diode as recited in instant claim 19.

Paragraph 0254. According to Tamoto, the charger can be a contact charger or preferably a proximity charger as recited in instant claims 20-22. Paragraphs 0246 and 0248-0249. Tamoto further teaches that the image forming apparatus can comprise a plurality of image forming units. See Fig. 7 and paragraphs 0266-0267. The Tamoto process cartridge comprises a photoreceptor 16, a charger 17, an image irradiator 19, and an image developer 20. Fig. 9 and paragraph 0277.

Tamoto does not exemplify a charge generation layer coating solution comprising its titanyl phthalocyanine pigment having an average particle diameter as recited in the instant claims. However, as discussed supra, Tamoto exemplifies a charge generation layer comprising its titanyl phthalocyanine and polyvinyl butyral resin. See paragraph 0418. Tamoto teaches that the charge generation layer is prepared by mixing the charge generation material with a proper solvent and binder resin and dispersing the mixture with "a ball mill . . . to prepare a coating liquid." Paragraphs 0103.

Hashimoto teaches a method of preparing a charge generation dispersion liquid for forming a charge generation layer comprising the step of dispersing a charge generation pigment or dye with a binder resin with a ball-shaped pulverizing media in a dispersing solvent to an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 or 0.18 μm . The average particle sizes of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 or 0.18 μm , are within the particle diameter limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claims 1 and 28. The discussion of Hashimoto in paragraph 10 above is incorporated herein by reference.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto, to prepare a charge generation dispersion coating solution comprising the Tamoto titanyl phthalocyanine pigment and its polyvinylbutyral binder resin, as taught by Hashimoto, such that the resultant dispersion solution comprises titanyl phthalocyanine pigment dispersoids having an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 or 0.18 μm , and to use the resultant dispersion solution to form the charge generation layer in the photoreceptors in examples 32 and 35 of Tamoto. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic photoreceptor, an image forming apparatus, and a process cartridge have improved

stability and excellent photoconductive properties as taught by Hashimoto.

Instant claim 7 is written in product-by-process format. The combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto do not disclose that the charge generation layer is formed by the method recited in the instant claim 7. However, as discussed above, the combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto render obvious a titanyl phthalocyanine pigment having an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , e.g., 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm . The average particle sizes of 0.15 or 0.18 μm meet the average particle size limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claim 7. Because the average particle size of 0.15 or 0.18 μm is much smaller than the average particle size limitation of not greater than 0.3 μm recited in instant claim 7, it is reasonable to conclude that the average particle size of 0.15 or 0.18 μm meets the particle size standard deviation of "not greater than 0.2 μm " recited in instant claim 7. Thus, it appears that the charge generation layer rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto is the same or substantially the same as the instantly recited charge generation layer made by the process recited in instant claim 7. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed.

Cir. 1983); In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985);
MPEP 2113.

Instant claim 8 is written in product-by-process format. Tamoto does not disclose that its titanyl phthalocyanine material is obtained by the method recited in instant claim 8. However, the Tamoto titanyl phthalocyanine pigment exhibits an X-ray diffraction spectrum appears to meet the limitations recited in instant claims 1, 28, 30, and 31. The titanyl phthalocyanine pigment average particle size of 0.15 μm or 0.18 μm rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto meets the particle size limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claims 1 and 28. Therefore, it appears that the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto is the same or substantially the same as the instantly recited titanyl phthalocyanine crystal made by the process steps recited in the instant claim. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. Marosi; Thorpe; MPEP 2113.

Tamoto also does not exemplify a photoreceptor comprising an undercoat layer having the surface roughness as recited in the instant claims. However, Tamoto does not limit the type of undercoat layer used. Paragraph 0194.

Takaya teaches the benefits of using of a particular intermediate layer located between the charge generation layer and the electroconductive substrate of an electrophotographic photosensitive member, which has a 10-point surface roughness Rz of 0.5 μm . The discussion of Takaya in paragraph 10 above is incorporated herein by reference.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings in Takaya, to use the undercoat layer taught by Takaya having a 10-point surface roughness Rz of 0.5 μm as the undercoat layer in the photoreceptors rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto, and to use the resultant photoreceptor in the image forming apparatus and process cartridge rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic photoreceptor, an image forming apparatus, and a process cartridge that prevent the occurrence of interference fringes and exhibit excellent potential characteristics and image forming characteristics free from difficulties over a variety of temperature and humidity environment conditions as disclosed by Takaya.

The combined teachings of Tamoto, Hashimoto, and Takaya meet the surface roughness - particle size relationships recited

in instant claims 1 and 28. As discussed supra, the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment particles in the charge generation layer rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto have an average particle size of 0.15 or 0.18 μm . The average particle sizes of 0.15 and 0.18 μm are smaller than the Takaya undercoat layer 10-point surface roughness of 0.5 μm and are also not greater than 2/3 of the roughness of 0.5 μm (i.e., 0.33 μm), as recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

15. Applicants' arguments filed on Jul. 12, 2007, as applicable to the rejections set forth in paragraphs 10-14 above, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants assert that none of the references discloses or suggests the instantly claimed photoreceptor for applicants' various reasons.

Applicants' assertion is not persuasive. The reasons for combining the references do not have to be those of applicants.

Applicants' assertion that the charge transport layer (CTL) in example 28 of Niimi'633 (which is formed using methylene chloride) cannot be made with tetrahydrofuran (THF) is mere attorney argument. Applicants have not provided any evidence to support their assertion. Furthermore, there is no teaching in Niimi'633 that discloses or suggests that a CTL comprising a

polyarylate and the charge transport compound used in the CTL in example 28 cannot be formed using solvents other than methylene chloride, such as THF. See Niimi'633 paragraphs 0170 and 0173, which list, respectively, examples of CTL binder resins, which include polyarylate, and examples of CTL solvents, which include THF. In any event, as discussed in paragraph 10 above, the photoreceptor exemplified in example 6 of Niimi'633 comprises a charge transport layer made with the halogen-free solvent tetrahydrofuran. Niimi'633 teaches that the charge generation material used in its charge generation layer can be a titanyl phthalocyanine. Niimi'633 also exemplifies such a charge generation layer (CGL) in example 28. As discussed in paragraph 10 above and admitted by applicants in the response filed on Jul. 12, 2007, page 24, lines 4-5, it is well known that the use of chlorinated solvents, which are halogenated solvents, have environmental safety problems. Thus, for the reasons discussed in paragraph 10 above, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the CGL in example 28 of Niimi'633 as the CGL in the photoreceptor exemplified in example 6 of Niimi'633.

As discussed in paragraph 12 above, Oshiba teaches that its CTL in example 26 can also be made using methyl ethyl ketone, which is a non-halogenated solvent. Contrary to applicants'

Art Unit: 1756

assertion in the response filed on Jul. 12, 2007, the paragraph bridging pages 23 and 24, it is applicants that have misunderstood the teachings in Oshiba at col. 30, lines 47-49. There, Oshiba discloses that "[o]f these solvents [listed at col. 30, lines 35-47], most preferably employed are dichloromethane, 1,2-dichloroethane, or methyl ethyl ketone." The Oshiba teaching does not limit its preferred solvents to the two chlorinated solvents; but includes the non-halogenated solvent methyl ethyl ketone. Furthermore, as discussed in the rejection in paragraph 12, the choice of methyl ethyl ketone from a list of three solvents would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art. As discussed in paragraph 12 above and admitted by applicants in the response filed on Jul. 12, 2007, page 24, lines 4-5, it is well known that the use of chlorinated solvents, which are halogenated solvents, have environmental safety problems. Thus, for the reasons discussed in paragraph 12 above, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to form the CTL with the solvent methyl ethyl ketone in the photoreceptor in example 26 of Oshiba.

As discussed in paragraph 14 above, Tamoto teaches photoreceptors comprising a CTL formed with the solvent toluene,

Art Unit: 1756

which is a non-halogenated solvent, and a charge generation layer comprising a titanyl phthalocyanine.

For the reasons discussed in the rejections in paragraphs 10, 12, and 14 above, Hashimoto provides reason, suggestion, and motivation to make and use a charge generation layer coating solution comprising the titanyl phthalocyanine pigment taught by Niimi' 633, JP' 538, or Tamoto, as taught by Hashimoto, such that the resultant pigment dispersoids have an average particle size of about 0.1 to 0.3 μm , such as 0.15 or 0.18 μm . Takaya provides reason, suggestion, and motivation to use its intermediate layer as the intermediate layer in the photoreceptors rendered obvious over the combined teachings of Niimi' 633, Chambers, and Hashimoto and over the combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto. Furthermore, the combined teachings of Niimi' 633, Chambers, Hashimoto, and Takaya, the combined teachings of Oshiba, Chambers, JP' 358, and Hashimoto, and the combined teachings of Tamoto and Hashimoto, render obvious photoreceptors that meet the compositional, particle size, and surface roughness limitations recited in the instant claims.

Accordingly, the rejections set forth in paragraphs 10-14 stand.

Applicants do not assert that the instantly claimed photoreceptors provide "unexpected" results over the prior art photoreceptors. Rather applicants assert that the references do not disclose the "superior properties of the claimed photoreceptors" shown in the examples of the present invention.

However, as discussed supra, the reasons for combining the references do not have to be those of applicants. Furthermore, the showing in the instant specification is insufficient to show that the instantly claimed invention yields unexpectedly "superior" results.

The photoconductors in examples 1-16 are not commensurate in scope with the instant claims for the following reasons:

(1) In examples 9 and 11-13, the photoreceptors comprise titanyl phthalocyanines (TiOPc's) of synthesis examples 3 and 5-7, respectively, that have X-ray diffraction spectra, which are outside the scope of instant claims 1 and 28. See Table 1 at page 71.

(2) In examples 8 and 10, the photoreceptors comprise TiOPc's of synthesis examples 2 and 4, respectively. There is no evidence in the present record showing that said TiOPc's have an X-ray diffraction spectrum as recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

Art Unit: 1756

(3) In example 14, the photoreceptor comprises the TiOPc of synthesis example 8. As discussed in paragraph 8 above, the X-ray diffraction spectrum in Fig. 14 of that TiOPc does not appear to have a "peak" at a Bragg angle of $23.5^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$. Thus, the TiOPc of synthesis example 8 is outside the scope of instant claims 1 and 28.

(4) In examples 1-7, 15, and 16, the photoreceptors comprise the TiOPc of synthesis example 1. However, for the reasons discussed in paragraph 8 above, it is not clear whether the TiOPc made in synthesis 1 is commensurate in scope with the TiOPc recited in instant claims 1 and 28. In particular, it is not clear whether the TiOPc has the X-ray diffraction spectrum recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

(5) With respect to the rejections over Oshiba, the photoreceptors in examples 1-16 are preferred because they comprise charge transport layers formed with a preferred non-halogenated solvent. See instant claim 16. Thus, the showing in the instant specification does not show that the full scope of instant claims 1 and 28 provides the results exhibited by examples 1-16 shown in Table 2.

Thus, it is not clear whether the showing in the instant specification shows that the instantly claimed invention yields the "superior" results shown in Table 2.

Moreover, the showing in the instant specification does not appear to provide a probative comparison to Niimi' 633, Oshiba, or Tamoto.

Niimi' 633 exemplifies a photoreceptor that exhibits stable charging properties, i.e., residual potential properties, and that provides images with "good" image qualities. See Niimi' 633, Table 2 at page 28, example 6. The Niimi' 663 photoreceptor comprises an electrically conductive substrate, an intermediate layer, a CGL comprising a particular azo pigment, a CTL formed using THF, and a particular protective layer.

Oshiba exemplifies a photoreceptor that provides in both ambient conditions of 20°C at 60%RH and at 30°C at 80%RH, 50,000 copies with no background staining and an image density of at least 1.2 in the solid black areas. See Oshiba, col. 43, lines 44-56, example 26. The Oshiba photoreceptor in example 26 comprises an electrically conductive substrate having a Rz roughness of 1.0 μm , an intermediate layer, a CGL comprising a titanyl phthalocyanine and a silicone resin, a CTL formed using 1,2-dichloroethane, and a particular protective layer.

Tamoto exemplifies photoreceptors that exhibit stable residual potential properties after 10,000 copies, and that provide images with "good" image qualities after 50,000 copies. See Tamoto, Table 2 at page 60, examples 32 and 35. The Tamoto

photoreceptors comprise an electrically conductive substrate, an intermediate layer, a CGL comprising a titanyl phthalocyanine having an X-ray diffraction spectrum that appears to meet the spectrum recited in the instant claims and a polyvinyl butyral binder resin, a CTL formed using toluene, and a particular protective layer.

None of the comparative examples 1-8 appear to exemplify the photoreceptors disclosed by the prior art.

Furthermore, applicants in the response filed on Jul. 12, 2007, page 24, state, "Niimi'633 and Oshiba are similar to Reference examples 1 and 2 of the present application." Applicants state that "[r]eference examples 1 and 2 are comparative examples in view of the concept of the present invention." Reference examples 1 and 2 exemplify photoreceptors that are the same as example 1, but comprise CTL's made from a halogenated solvent. As noted by applicants, those photoreceptors exhibit good performance. The examiner notes that those photoreceptors exhibit the same or similar results in image quality and potential properties, i.e., photosensitivity, as exhibited by the photoreceptors in examples 1 to 7, which comprise charge transport layers made by the non-halogenated solvents, tetrahydrofuran or dioxolan. See Table 2 of the instant specification. Thus, based on

Art Unit: 1756

applicants' comments, the instant claimed photoreceptor does not appear to provide unexpected results over the prior art.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above and in the rejections in paragraphs 10-14 above, the prior art rejections stand.

16. Claims 1, 7-22, 28, 30, and 31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10, 12-18, and 20-26 of copending Application No. 10/804,067 (Application'067), as evidenced by that portion of the disclosure in Application'067 that supports the claimed subject matter in claims 1-10, 12-18, and 20-26 of Application'067, and the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter recited in the claims of Application'067 renders the subject matter recited in the instant claims obvious.

Reference claims 2 and 3, which each depend directly from reference claim 1, recite an electrophotographic photoconductor

Art Unit: 1756

comprising an electroconductive substrate, a charge generation layer, and a charge transport layer formed on the charge generation layer using a halogen-free solvent. The charge transport layer comprises a polycarbonate having a triarylamine structure that meets the polycarbonate resin recited in instant claim 9. The charge generation layer comprises a particular polyvinyl acetal resin and a charge generation material that has an average particle diameter smaller than the "surface roughness plane," where the plane is the electroconductive substrate or an interlayer disposed between the substrate and the charge generation layer, recited in reference claims 2 and 3, respectively. The "surface roughness plane" has the same meaning as "surface roughness" recited in the instant claims. Compare paragraph 4 above and Application'067, page 3, paragraph 0052. Reference claim 4, which depends on reference claim 1, requires that the average particle diameter of the charge generation material be 0.3 μm or less and two-thirds or less than the surface roughness of the plane, which meets the particle size limitations recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

The subject matter recited in reference claims 5-10 and 12-18, which depend from reference claim 1, expressly meets the titanyl phthalocyanine, the process limitation, the charge transport polymer, the surface protective layer, the substrate,

Art Unit: 1756

and non-halogenated solvent limitations recited in instant claims 1, 7, 8, 10-16, 28, 30, and 31, respectively, but for the limitation that the X-ray diffraction spectrum has peaks at angles 9.5°, 9.7°, and 23.5° recited in instant claims 1 and 28, and the chemical structure recited in instant claim 28.

However, as evidenced by the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, it is well known that titanyl phthalocyanine has a chemical structure that is within the compositional limitations of formula (1) recited in instant claim 28, when the indexes m, n, j, and k are 0. As discussed above, the peaks at the Bragg angles in the X-ray diffraction spectrum recited in Application'067 are within the scope of the X-ray diffraction spectrum recited in instant claims 28. That spectrum is also within the scope of the diffraction spectrum recited in instant claims 1 and 28, but for the peaks at 9.5°, 9.7°, and 23.5°. Furthermore, that portion of Application'067 that supports the titanyl phthalocyanine crystal recited in the reference claims teaches that such a titanyl phthalocyanine crystal has an X-ray diffraction spectrum that has peak at Bragg angles 9.5°, 9.7°, and 23.5°. See Application'067, preparation example at pages 50-52 and Fig. 6. When addressing the use of whether a claim in the application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in a patent, "those portions of the

specification which support the patent claims may be also be examined and considered." See MPEP 804, II.B.1, p. 800-22 (MPEP 8th edition, Rev. Aug. 2006), citing In re Vogel, 164 USPA 619, 622 (CCPA 1970). Thus, it is reasonable to presume that the titanyl phthalocyanine crystal recited in the reference claims of Application'067 has the chemical structure recited in instant claim 28 and has an X-ray diffraction spectrum that has peaks at the Bragg angles of 9.5°, 9.7°, and 23.5° as shown in Application'067 Fig. 6 that meets the spectrum recited in instant claims 1 and 28. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. Fitzgerald, supra.

References 20 and 22-26 recite an image forming apparatus comprising an image forming unit that comprises a charging unit, a light-irradiating unit, a developing unit, and a transferring unit that meet the charging, light-irradiating unit, developing unit, and transporting unit limitations recited in instant claims 17 and 19-22. Reference 21, which depends on reference claim 20, further requires that the image forming apparatus comprise a plurality of image forming units that meets the apparatus limitation recited in instant claim 18. The apparatus recited in the claims of Application'067 comprises a photoconductor as recited in reference claim 1.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the subject matter recited in the claims of Application'067, as evidenced by that portion of the disclosure in Application'067 that supports the claimed subject matter in claims of Application'067, and the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, to make and use an electrophotographic photoconductor that meets the photoreceptor limitations recited in the instant claims, and to use the resultant photoconductor in the imaging apparatus recited in Application'067. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic photoconductor and an imaging apparatus that could be used successfully in an electrophotographic process to form toner images.

17. Claims 1, 8-10, 15-18, 20-23, 28, 30, and 31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of copending Application No. 10/656,280 (Application'280), as evidenced by that portion of the disclosure in Application'280 that supports the claimed subject matter in claims 1-18 of Application'280, and the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, in view of Takaya and US 4,734,348 (Suzuki).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Reference claim 8, which depends from claim 7, which in turn depends from reference claim 1, recites an image forming apparatus comprising an electrophotographic photoreceptor comprising an electroconductive substrate, a charge generation layer, and a charge transport layer formed on the charge generation layer using the non-halogen solvent of cyclic ethers or aromatic hydrocarbons. The charge transport layer meets the charge transport layer limitations recited in instant claims 1, 16, and 28. The charge generation layer comprises titanyl phthalocyanine crystals. The titanyl phthalocyanine crystal has an CuK α 1.542 Angstrom X-ray diffraction spectrum comprising a maximum peak at a Bragg angle of $27.2^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ and a peak at a lowest Bragg angle of $7.3^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ and peaks at $9.4^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$ and $9.6^\circ \pm 0.2^\circ$. No diffraction peak is observed within a range of from 7.4° to 9.3° , which meets the limitations recited in instant claims 30 and 31. Reference claim 2, which depends from claim 1, requires that the X-ray diffraction spectrum comprise no peak at a Bragg angle of 26.3° .

The claims of Application'280 do not recite that the titanyl phthalocyanine crystal has the chemical structure in formula (1) recited in instant claim 28. Nor do the claims of

Art Unit: 1756

Application'280 recite that the titanyl phthalocyanine crystal X-ray diffraction spectrum has a peak at the Bragg angle of $23.5^{\circ} \pm 0.2^{\circ}$ as recited in instant claims 1 and 28. However, as evidenced by the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, it is well known that titanyl phthalocyanine has a chemical structure that is within the compositional limitations of formula (1) recited in instant claim 28, when the indexes m, n, j, and k are 0. As discussed above, the peaks at the Bragg angles in the X-ray diffraction spectrum recited in Application'280 are within the scope of the X-ray diffraction spectrum recited in instant claims 1 and 28, but for the peak at 23.5° . Furthermore, that portion of Application'280 that supports the titanyl phthalocyanine crystal recited in the reference claims teaches that such a titanyl phthalocyanine crystal has an X-ray diffraction spectrum that has a peak at the Bragg angle of 23.5° . See Application'280, synthesis example 1 at pages 84-85, example 1 at pages 93-94, and Fig. 9. When addressing the use of whether a claim in the application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in a patent, "those portions of the specification which support the patent claims may be also be examined and considered." See MPEP 804,II.B.1, p. 800-22, citing In re Vogel, 164 USPA 619, 622 (CCPA 1970). Thus, it is reasonable to presume that the titanyl phthalocyanine crystal

Art Unit: 1756

recited in the reference claims of Application'280 has the chemical structure recited in instant claim 28 and has an X-ray diffraction spectrum that has a peak at the Bragg angle of 23.5° as shown in Application'280 Fig. 9 that meets the spectrum recited in instant claims 1, 28, 30, and 31. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. Fitzgerald, supra.

Reference claim 3, which depends from reference claim 1, requires that the titanyl phthalocyanine crystals have an average primary particle size of less than 0.3 µm, which is within the particle size limitation recited in instant claims 1 and 28. Reference claim 4, which depends from reference claim 1, requires that the charge transport layer comprise a polycarbonate having, on the main chain and/or side chain thereof, a triarylamine structure, which meets the charge transport polymer limitations recited in instant claim 9. Reference claim 5, which depend from reference claim 1, requires that the photoreceptor further comprise a protective layer that meets the surface protective layer limitations recited in instant claim 10. Reference claim 9, which depends on reference claim 1, requires that the conductive substrate comprise an oxide film formed by anodization. The anodized oxide film meets the substrate limitation recited in instant claim 15.

Reference claims 1 and 11-15 recite that the image forming apparatus further comprises a charging unit, a light-irradiating unit, a developing unit, and a transferring unit that meet the charging, light-irradiating unit, developing unit, and transporting unit limitations recited in instant claims 17 and 20-22. Reference claim 10, which depends on reference claim 1, further requires that the image forming apparatus comprise a plurality of image forming units, thereby meeting the apparatus limitation recited in instant claim 18. Reference claim 15, which depends from reference claim 1, further requires that the apparatus comprise a detachable cartridge comprising the photoreceptor and a member selected from the group consisting of a charger, an irradiator, and a developer, which meets the unit limitations recited in instant claim 23.

Instant claim 8 is written in product-by-process format. The reference claims do not recite that the titanyl phthalocyanine material is obtained by the method recited in instant claim 8. However, the titanyl phthalocyanine material recited in the claims of Application'280 exhibits an X-ray diffraction spectrum that appears to meet the limitations recited in instant claims 1 and 28, and the particle size limitation of "not greater than 0.3 μm " recited in instant claims 1 and 28. Therefore, it appears that the titanyl

phthalocyanine material recited in the claims of Application'280 is the same or substantially the same as the instantly recited titanyl phthalocyanine crystal made by the process steps recited in the instant claim. The burden is on applicants to prove otherwise. Marosi; Thorpe; MPEP 2113.

The reference claims do not recite the presence of an intermediate layer located between the electroconductive substrate and the charge generation layer having a surface roughness as recited in the instant claims.

Takaya teaches the benefits of using of a particular intermediate layer located between the charge generation layer and the electroconductive substrate of an electrophotographic photosensitive member, which has a 10-point surface roughness Rz of 0.5 μm . The discussion of Takaya in paragraph 10 above is incorporated herein by reference.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the subject matter recited in the reference claims in Application'280, as evidenced by that portion of the disclosure in Application'280 that supports the claimed subject matter in claims of Application'280 and the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, and the teachings in Takaya, to use the intermediate layer taught by Takaya having a 10-point surface roughness Rz of 0.5 μm between the electroconductive

substrate and the charge generation layer in the photoreceptor recited in the reference claims of Application'280, wherein the titanyl phthalocyanine crystals have an average primary particle size of less than 0.3 μm , and the charge transport layer is formed from a non-halogen solvent. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an electrophotographic photoreceptor, an image forming apparatus, and a process cartridge that prevent the occurrence of interference fringes and exhibit excellent potential characteristics and image forming characteristics free from difficulties over a variety of temperature and humidity environment conditions as disclosed by Takaya.

The reference claims also do not recite that the charge generation layer comprises a polyvinyl acetal binder resin.

Suzuki discloses a polyvinyl acetal resin that meets the limitations recited in instant claims 1, 17, 23, and 28. See Example 11 at col. 13. Suzuki discloses that the polyvinyl acetal resin can be used as the binder resin in a single photosensitive layer or in a charge generation layer. Col. 4, lines 10-13. Suzuki discloses that said polyvinyl acetal resin provides photosensitive layers having stably dispersed photoconductive particles and excellent electric properties,

Art Unit: 1756

such as high sensitivity and low residual potential. Col. 2, lines 10-15, and col. 11, lines 56-60.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of subject matter recited in the reference claims of Application'280 and the teachings of Suzuki, to use the Suzuki polyvinyl acetal resin as the binder resin in the charge generation layer in the photoreceptor rendered obvious over the subject matter recited in the reference claims of Application'280, as evidenced by that portion of the disclosure in Application'280 that supports the claimed subject matter in claims of Application'280 and the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, combined with the teachings of Takaya. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining a stable titanyl phthalocyanine dispersion and a photoreceptor, an image forming apparatus, and a process cartridge that have excellent electric properties, such as high sensitivity and low residual potential, as disclosed by Suzuki.

The subject matter recited in the reference claims of Application'280, as evidenced by that portion of the disclosure in Application'280 that supports the claimed subject matter in claims of Application'280 and the ACS File Registry RN 26201-32-1, combined with the teachings of Takaya and Suzuki meet the surface roughness - particle size relationships recited

Art Unit: 1756

in instant claims 1 and 28. As discussed supra, the titanyl phthalocyanine crystal particles in the charge generation layer recited in the reference claims of Application'280 have an average primary particle diameter of less than 0.3 μm . The average primary particle diameter of less than 0.3 μm is smaller than the Takaya undercoat layer 10-point surface roughness of 0.5 μm and is also not greater than 2/3 of the roughness of 0.5 μm (i.e., 0.33 μm), as recited in instant claims 1 and 28.

18. In the response filed on Jul. 12, 2007, applicants did not traverse the rejections over the copending applications set forth in paragraphs 16 and 17 above. Accordingly, the rejections stand.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janis L. Dote whose telephone number is (571) 272-1382. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Mark Huff, can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry regarding papers not received regarding this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Supervisory Application Examiner Ms. Claudia Sullivan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1052.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 1756

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Janis L. Dote
JANIS L. DOTE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1600
1700

JLD
Aug. 3, 2007